IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 21529 of 2004

Between:

1 M/s. Sairam Clay Products Pvt. Ltd., rep by its Director Shri Vaddi Veerabhadra Rao,
having its Regd. IDA Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.
2 Vaddi Veerabhadra Rao, S/o. Seshaiah,
M/s. Sairam Clay Products Pvt. Ltd., r/o. Narendrapuram, Near Rajanagaram Mandal,
Rajahmundry, E.G. District.

..... PETITIONER(S)

AND

1 State of AP rep by Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad.
2 State of AP rep by Addl. DGP, Law and Order, Hyderabad.
3 District Forest Officer, Ranga Reddy District.
4 APSFC, rep by its Managing Director, Chirag-Ali-Lane, Gunfoundry, Hyderabad.
5 Singareni Collieries, rep by its Managing Director, Lakdikapul, Hyderabad.
6 Factories Inspector, Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.
7 Asst. Commissioner of Labour, Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.
8 B. Vinod Kumar, S/o. B. Venkateswar Rao, V Phase,
Plot No. 1, IDA Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to call for the records and issue a writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 7 to take up the necessary action on the basis of the complaints given by the petitioner and investigate into the same and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.M.SIVANANDA KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent No.: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO. 21529 of 2004

ORDER:

The 1st petitioner is an industry and the 2nd petitioner claims to be one of the Directors. They claim to have submitted complaint with the respondents 1 to 7, alleging that the 8th respondent had removed certain valuable finished product as well as raw material from the premises of the 1st petitioner, after the 4th respondent had seized the property. They seek appropriate directions in this regard.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Government Pleader for Home, and learned Standing Counsel for the 4th respondent.

The grievance of the petitioners is about the alleged inaction on the part of the respondents 1 to 7, and in particular, respondents 4, 6 and 7, in taking action on the complaints/representations said to have been made by the petitioners. Though elaborate submissions are made on merits of the matter, this Court is not inclined, either to record any findings, or make any observations on the merits and demerits of the complaint. Irrespective of the nature and veracity of such complaints, whenever the same are made to statutory and Government agencies, the minimum expected of them is, to respond to the same. The nature of action to be taken thereon would depend on the ultimate decision of such authority. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of, directing that respondents 4, 6 and 7, to whom the complaints/representations are said to have been made, to dispose of the same, or initiate such action as is open to them in law, within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

L. NARASIMHA REDDY, J.

Dt.06-12-2004

KO

To

1 State of AP rep by Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad.
2 State of AP rep by Addl. DGP, Law and Order, Hyderabad.
3 District Forest Officer, Ranga Reddy District.
4 APSFC, rep by its Managing Director, Chirag-Ali-Lane, Gunfoundry, Hyderabad.
5 Singareni Collieries, rep by its Managing Director, Lakdikapul, Hyderabad.
6 Factories Inspector, Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.
7 Asst. Commissioner of Labour, Jeedimetla, Hyderabad.
8 2 C.Cs to G.P. For Home, High Court of A.P., High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad (OUT).

9. 2 C.D. copies.